JIM CONLEY WILLING TO MEET DETECTIVE BURNS AT ANY TIME

Negro’s Only Condition Is That Some Disinterested

White Man Be Present to See

He Is Given Fair Treatment

FRANK GRAND JURY MAY

HOLD ANOTHER SESSION

Parents of Lula Belle Brown

Charge Detectives Tried to

Coerce Her Into Saying She Accompanied Mary Phagan to Factory

---

The declaration of Jim Conley, convicted as an accomplice in the Mary Phagan murder, that he is perfectly willing to see Detective William J. Burns and answer every question put to him, was an unlooked one for development in the Frank case Thursday morning.

That Burns will make an effort to interview the negro, who has been so zealously guarded from questioners practically since the day he admitted writing the murder notes, is now almost certain.

Burns is expected to arrive in Atlanta Friday and one of his first moves will probably be an interview with the negro.

That Burns, despite the remarkable powers attributed to him, will secure a confession is not regarded as likely even by the ardent friends of Frank, who are convinced the negro is the real murderer. They believe, however, that the famous detective may, if he talks with the negro, penetrate some point in the negro's story, which will cause the whole fabric to collapse.

Conley says he is perfectly willing to see and talk with Burns and that he asks only that some other white man, not a friend of Frank, be present at the interview.

LAWYER MAY OBJECT.

Despite the willingness of the negro to see Burns under his own conditions, it is not improbable that his attorney, William M. Smith, will attempt to prevent an interview.

Mr. Smith did not take a definite stand, but intimated to reporters that the detective would not be given a free reign with the negro.

“I don’t propose to stand for any third-degree work” says Attorney Smith, “but further than I can make no statement now. My client must be protected, but I want to do anything that is fair and right in the matter, and I certainly won’t say at this time that I will attempt to prevent an interview.”

In the opinion of Newport Lanford, chief of the Atlanta detective department. Detective Burns will fail to get results if he does question Jim Conley.

“Conley has told the truth and all the truth,” said Chief Lanford Thursday morning. “I don’t care what methods Burns sues, he won’t get anything more out of the negro than has already been obtained by the men who worked the case.”

DETECTIVES ACCUSED.

Charges that city detectives, among them John Black, endeavored to coerce their daughter, Lula Belle Brown, into saying she was the mysterious “girl in the red dress” were made to John Cox, an attaché of Attorney Reuben R. Arnold’s office, in the presence of reporters Thursday afternoon by Mr. And Mrs. W. S. Jenkins, of West Fourteenth street.

Jenkins and his wife declared detectives came to their home one Sunday, and again the following Monday, and interviewed their daughter, who is now in the reformatory at Milledgeville and

whose husband is said to be in the chaingang, and that one of the detectives told the girl he would give her part of his salary if she would say she was the “girl in the red dress” who was supposed to have gone to the factory with Mary Phagan and to have been told by Frank that she need not wait for Mary, as she would be detained at the factory for some time.

Mr. and Mrs. Jenkins both declare their daughter told the detectives repeatedly she was not the girl in the red dress, that she did not know either Mary Phagan or Frank and that she had never visited the factory. Nevertheless, they assert, the detectives were insistent in their demands that she say she was the “girl in the red dress.”

After the visits Sunday and Monday, they say, the detectives came back again Monday night and told the girl that a Mrs. Moody, who lived at 10 East Fourteenth street, had told them Lula Belle was the girl in the red dress. Then they all went to Mrs. Moody’s home, according to the story told Thursday, and there Mrs. Moody denied ever having made any such

(Continued on Page Two Column Four.)

PDF PAGE 2, COLUMN 4

JIM CONLEY WILLING TO MEET DETECTIVE

BURNS AT ANY TIME

(Continued from Page One.)

statement. Jenkins and his wife both assert the detectives were overbearing and threatening in manner and said they had good grounds for locking the girl up. Their statement was taken down by John Cox for the defense, but whether it will be used as a part of the evidence on which an extraordinary motion for a new trial will be made is not known.

That the grand jury which last May indicted Leo M. Frank for the murder of Mary Phagan may be informally called together to discuss certain matters incident to the returning of the true bill against Frank was reported Thursday.

At the same time L. H. Beck, foreman of the jury, stated he had not been requested by any member to take such a step and that he could not say at the present time what he would do if the request is made of him.

PRESSES CLAIM FOR REWARD.

The claims committee of the city council Wednesday afternoon heard Attorney Lawton Nally contend in a long argument that R. P. Barrett, who found blood stains and hair on the second floor of the National Pencil factory, is entitled to the $1,000 reward offered by the city for evidence to convict the murderer of Mary Phagan.

No decision will be made by the council probably until the extraordinary motion for a new trial for Leo M. Frank has been filed and passed on by the courts. The sentiment among the members of the council committee, however, is that the finding of

the blood spots and hair was not definite or positive proof against Frank.

An interesting feature of the claims committee hearing was the testimony of Detective John Starnes, one of the prosecutors of Frank.

Starnes declared Frank was suspected of the murder long before Barrett found the blood and hair, which was on Monday following the crime on Saturday.

He said, however, that the evidence unearthed by Barrett was material in establishing that the murder was committed on the second floor of the factory.

The prosecution of Frank relied largely on the testimony of Conley to convict Frank. Detective Starnes admitted in replying to questions of Councilman Jesse Wood.

Edmondson Says Accuser Is a Pusillanimous Liar

E. B. Edmondson, the LaGrange constable, who is alleged to have located a new witness in the Leo M. Frank case, denounces in no uncertain terms a preacher from his home town who attacked him in a letter to Solicitor General Dorsey.

The letter of the preacher was made public by the solicitor’s office, but the writer’s name was withheld.

Edmondson not only denies every charge made against him, but characterizes the preacher as a pusillanimous liar, and urges him to come out like a man and make his name public.

Edmondson denies emphatically that there are any charges pending against him in Troup or any other county, and says the statements that he used the information in his possession in an effort to extort money from the Frank defense is a lie.

Keeps Him Up to Time

(Boston Transcript.)

“What is Flyppe’s wife’s first name?”

“Crystal. And it suits her.”

“How so?”

“She’s always on the watch.”

PDF PAGE 3, COLUMN 1

DR. WILMER COMMENDS

THE JOURNAL'S ATTITUDE

Rector of St. Lukes Church Thinks Leo Frank Should Be Given New Trial

---

Rev. Dr. C. B. Wilmer, rector of St. Luke's Episcopal church, Atlanta, has addressed a letter to The Journal commending its editorial of last Thursday urging that Leo M. Frank be given a new trial. The letter follows:

To the Editor of The Journal.

Dear Sir: I beg to congratulate you on your editorial in Monday's Journal headed, "Frank Should Have a New Trial," I am only one man, but I believe that everybody who feels about the matter as I do should come out and say so.

I have not arrived at this double conclusion, that Frank should have a new trial and that those who think so should

say so publicly, without giving thought to a very serious phase of the matter on the other side, viz., the danger and wrong, in general, of saying or doing anything that can tend to weaken the confidence of the public in our courts. I do not mean to reflect on the jury that convicted Frank. To the best of my information and belief they were honest in their verdict and not consciously swayed by hostile public opinion. I am not even questioning the correctness of the conclusion at which they arrived. It may be that this same conclusion would be arrived at by any honest and intelligent jury listening to all the evidence and viewing it in the “dry light of reason.” Nevertheless, the question remains: Ought Atlanta to stand for a trial conducted under the conditions surrounding this trial and which so vividly picture? On this question, Atlanta herself is on trial before the bar of enlightened public opinion all over the ‘country and, perhaps all over the civilized world.’”

I know, of course, that our supreme court has passed on the question of a new trial and refused it, although not unanimously. It is not in conflict with our duty to respect this decision, to say that it was a legal decision and that legal decisions, that is, eh points of law, do not always go to the bottom of the moral questions involved, or even profess to do so. Looking at the matter, then, from the moral point of view, it seems to me that there should be a trial of this case conducted in what one might call a more judicial atmosphere; especially in view of the fact that the trial judge himself was not convinced either way.

Furthermore, the very strong pressure of public opinion, or the opinion of at least a portion of the public, having been brought to bear against Frank is not the opinion of those who are in doubt as to the guilt of the accused in this case entitled to be heard, and the conviction of those who thoroughly disapprove of the conditions under which an adverse verdict was arrived at?

Then there is another reason in favor of a new trial, which I beg to mention without at all desiring to argue the case. To mention but one thing, I refer to the point made by Mr. Alexander in his pamphlet analyzing the note written admittedly by Conley, that it is exceedingly improbable that this note so full of negro superstition should have been dictated by a white man. This point was not brought to the attention of the jury and is certainly worth considering.

Finally, the moral value of an execution must depend in great measure, in these democratic days, on the satisfaction of the public mind with the justice of the verdict of guilty. For all these reasons I beg to join with you in expressing the wish that some way might be found for a new trial of the accused in this case. As you so well point out, if guilty, he can be found guilty again and under circumstances to carry along with that decision the concurrence of at least the acquiescence of the whole public; if innocent he can be acquitted and judicial murder be prevented.

In the meantime, Mr. Editor, you have rendered a public service by bravely calling attention to certain things in connection with the trial that were not right, and in so doing you have given an illustration of what is possible for journalism when it sees itself to be more like the pole star and less like a wealthier vane.

Yours truly,

C. B. WILMER,

Rector St. Luke’s church.

Atlanta Ga., March 12, 1914.

PDF PAGE 6, COLUMN 4

Georgia Papers Urge New Trial for Frank

(Albany Herald.)

Contending that Leo Frank did not have a fair trial, and without entering into a discussion of facts bearing on the condemned man's probable guilt or innocence. The Atlanta Journal, in a leading editorial in its Tuesday afternoon's issue, demands, in the name of public opinion, a new trial for the man convicted of the murder of Mary Phagan.

The Journal treats the Frank case as "a finished case," so far as the courts are concerned, and one which a newspaper may, therefore, discuss with entire propriety. The conviction of the accused man has been affirmed by the state supreme court, and Frank will be hanged April 17, unless the extraordinary motion to be made by his attorneys for a new trial should be granted by his attorneys for a new trial should be granted, or executive clemency in his behalf should be exercised.

We believe The Atlanta Journal's position is correct. The Herald has given expression to similar views since the supreme court handed down its decision in the celebrated case, and subsequent developments have but strengthened our conviction.

We do not believe any twelve men in Georgia are so immune to the influences of passion, prejudice and the spirit of mob law, as manifested in Atlanta at the time of Frank's trial, that they could fail to be so swayed by them as to be incapable of fairness to the accused. There was never a trial in Georgia like the Frank trial, and the sober second thought of a people who are above all things fair-minded now demands that the injustice hastily done be undone while there is yet time.

It is not within the province of a newspaper to tell the courts what they should or should not do, but it is right and privilege to speak for fairness and justice when both are being forgotten or ignored.

(Rome Tribune-Herald.)

We are pleased to note that The Atlanta Journal comes boldly out and demands a new trial for Leo Frank. That is right and proper from the fact that the crime was committed in the city of Atlanta, its home.

On last Sunday morning, believing it to be our duty, the Tribune-Harald made a similar demand, requesting the press of the state to speak out and prevent the execution of Frank, if possible, from the lack of reliable testimony as submitted in the trial and under the excited of the people at the time.

We have maintained from the first that the character of the evidence was not sufficient to convict any man for the crime of murder. By all means give the unfortunate man a new trial that justice may prevail.